

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 15, 1854.

NO. 16.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS—One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

The Hidden Manna.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM.

The 'Bread of Life!' the saints' real nutriment,
By which, as by the life-imparting fruit,
Their moral natures grow and gather health,—
Not of that earthly sort, which feels decline,
And fades away in death,—but that which, like
The 'Living Water' of the living fount,
Springs upwards 'into Everlasting Life.'

"To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the Hidden Manna." Such was the gracious encouragement which John was commanded to send, in his heaven-indited epistle, to the martyr church at Pergamos. That primitive society of the apostolical age had been called to pass through the fires of a sanguinary persecution, and, like their Lord, to take up the cross in its most self-denying form; and the words just cited were designed to comfort and strengthen them in the endurance of these afflictions. No doubt they were eminently adapted to this end, and that they ministered just that kind of consolation which the necessities of the suffering church required. "The Hidden Manna!" what are we to understand by this metaphoric language? The word "Manna" at once suggests that our text has a historic reference, and our minds revert to the period of Israel's journeyings for forty years in the wilderness, where they were miraculously sustained by "Manna,"—a preternatural kind of bread. But for this extraordinary method of sustaining the Hebrews in the wilderness, they must have all perished.

To this memorable circumstance our Lord alluded, in his reply to the multitude, whom he had miraculously fed in the desert, and who had followed him to Capernaum, whither he had proceeded after the events of that extraordinary evening. The sight of the approaching multitude, who, he knew, had followed him from mere sordid and selfish motives, excited our Lord's displeasure, and induced him openly to rebuke and admonish them. Smarting under the exposure of their motives, they arrogantly challenge his credentials. What dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written, "He gave them bread from heaven to eat." With strange infatuation they seem to have forgotten that they too, only a few

hours before, had eaten miraculous bread in the desert, supplied by him of whom they now rudely demand—"What dost thou work?" Without commenting on this lamentable infatuation, Jesus merely replied—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not *that bread* from heaven; but my Father giveth you the *true bread* from heaven. For the bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. . . . I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead. I am the living bread which came down from Heaven: if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever." The analogy between Christ as the bread from heaven for the nourishment and everlasting life of the world, and the manna of the wilderness for the preservation of the Israelites from death, is very apparent. As the Israelites in the desert would have died but for the manna, so mankind will perish in the eternal destruction of death if they have no hope in Christ,—the Resurrection and the Life of men.

Christ, then, is the heavenly manna or bread from heaven, because the life of mankind, as an everlasting possession, is in his hands, and is bestowed by him. "I am the way, the truth, and the life;" "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." "My sheep hear my voice, and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish." "I am the resurrection and the life." "I am that bread of life." The promise then of "hidden manna," to a martyr church, was pre-eminently suitable, for it told them in a beautifully expressive figure, that the lives which their fidelity should induce them to lay down for Christ, would not be finally and for ever forfeited, for they served one who could say, "He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever;" and "because I live, ye shall live also."

So far we have ascertained the probable meaning of the word "manna," but we have yet to explain the force of the adjective "hidden"—"the hidden manna."

There is a Jewish tradition, which some have imagined will explain this figure. It is said that Jeremiah, a short time previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, hid the ark of the testimony and its contents with some other sacred apparatus in a cave in Mount Sinai, and that they will be brought out again in the days of their Messiah. (See 2 Maccabees, i. 8.) Of course this is a mere fabulous legend, and cannot be reasonably supposed to be the circumstance hinted at in the figure under consideration.

Another explanation has been suggested by the fact, that the memorial pot of manna was laid up in the secrecy of the ark, and that it is called "hidden," for this reason. But this explanation

overlooks the important fact, that the manna was kept in the ark not for secrecy, but for frequent exposure before the people, as a memento of the memorable preservation in the wilderness. Had the manna been "hidden" in the ark, it would have defeated the object contemplated, by putting aside some to be miraculously preserved as a memorial. See Exodus xvi. 32-34.

It has been further suggested that the word "hidden" is to be understood of those secret supplies of strength and grace which Christ ministers to his militant people, in their earthly probation. But this is evidently not the explanation, for the "hidden manna," here spoken of, is not given to believers during their earthly pilgrimage, but as a future reward at the close of that pilgrimage. "To him that *overcometh*," which is obviously at the end, and not in the progress of their course.

A passage in Paul's writings seems to supply the true explanation. "For ye are dead, and your life is *hid* with Christ in God. When Christ, who is *our life*, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory."—Col. iii. 3, 4. Here the Christian's life is said to be *hid with Christ*; and Paul calls Christ "our life." Christ, too, says, "I am . . . the life;" and in a figure, "Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." The life of the christian is in the hands and power of Christ. Man has no life beyond the temporary life he now possesses. If he would live forever, he must be united to Christ. Union with Christ, by the bonds of genuine piety, establishes a title, by grace, to eternal life, which is bestowed as a gift or reward of grace through Christ.—Rom. vi. 23. And this gift of eternal life is bestowed by Christ, on the occasion of his second appearing, as "the resurrection and the life." Until his second advent, the lives of all his slumbering saints are in his hands, "hidden" in the mysterious secrecy of his great power. The exercise of that power, when he shall call upon his beloved dead to arise, will be the *revelation* of their, at present, "*hidden*" life. "Ye are dead, and *your life is hid* with Christ in God. When Christ, who is *our life*, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Well might the church at Pergamos be consoled, amidst its martyrdoms, with the promise, "To him that *overcometh*," or endureth to the end, "will I give to eat of the Hidden Manna." Who will not rejoice in this assurance as a promise made, not to one church only, but to the universal church of the faithful, and renouncing the presumptuous claim to an immortality, apart from Christ, exclaim, "Lord evermore give us this bread!" Believe it, christian, that you are dead, a mere mortal creature in yourself, destitute of any power of life beyond that ye now command in your momentary consciousness. Rob not Christ of this grand distinction as "the quickening spirit," but rejoicing in him as *your "life,"* ascribe to him the glory of your redemption from *mortality*, as well as from sin, and with the divinely taught Peter, say, "Lord, to whom shall we go, thou hast the words of eternal life."

SPIRIT:

OR, THE HEBREW TERMS "RUACH" AND "NESHAMAH," AND THE GREEK TERM "PNEUMA."

BY REV. WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

[Continued from p. 227.]

PNEUMA.—Greek Term.

SEC. I. PNEUMA is a noun: the verb is *pneo*, to breathe, to blow.

SEC. II. PNEUMA is rendered *wind* and *breath*.

1. *Wind*. John 3: 8, "The wind (*pneuma*) bloweth where it listeth."

Under this head, as we judge, ought to be introduced the passage—Heb. 1: 7, "who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire." This verse is rendered as follows by Moses Stewart, in his work on the Hebrews, "who maketh his angels winds, and his ministering servants flaming fire;" i. e., he adds, "who maketh his angels that serve him the ministers of his will, as the winds and the lightning are" . . . "The whole phrase is susceptible of another interpretation," observes the same commentator, "viz., who making his angels winds, i. e. swift as the winds, and his servants lightning, i. e. rapid, or terrible, or resistless as the lightning. But this does not suit the design for which the apostle quotes it, so well as the first interpretation. His object is to show that the angels are employed simply in a ministerial capacity; while the Son is *Lord* of all. Our English version, which has rendered *ruchoth* (Ps. 104: 4) by spirits, gives an erroneous view of the meaning of the original."

2. *Breath*. James 2: 26, "The body without the spirit (*pneuma*, margin "*breath*") is dead. Rev. 13: 15, "he had power to give life (*pneuma*, margin "*breath*") unto the image of the beast."

SEC. III. PNEUMA is rendered *life*.

Rev. 13: 15, "He had power to give life (*pneuma*) unto the image of the beast."

Life results from breathing, hence to give *pneuma*, or to cause a being to breathe, is to impart life to it. In this case our translators have put the effect, *life*, for its secondary cause, *breath*.

SEC. IV. PNEUMA is rendered *ghost*.

Matt. 27: 50, "Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost" (*pneuma*), or "expired." Rob. Lex. *pneuma* 2d. See also, Mark 15: 37. John 18: 30, "he said, it is finished: and he bowed his head and gave up the ghost" (*pneuma*).

These two passages are quoted, besides others, by Robinson in his Lexicon, under *pneuma* 2d, as examples of the use of the term *pneuma*, importing "the principle of life residing in the breath, breathed into man from God and again returning to God; compare Gen. 2: 7, Eccles. 12: 7, Ps. 104: 29." After all "the principle of life residing in the breath" is not a very clear expression. Why not say, *pneuma* in these passages designates life? He yielded up the ghost—the spirit—the spirit of life—or simply, life; i. e. he died. *Pneuma* is translated "*life*" in Rev. 13: 15; see the immediate preceding section.

Parallel to these verses is Luke 23 : 46, "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit (pneuma); and having said thus, he gave up the ghost," literally, breathed-out, expired, or died.

This, according to Robinson, is another verse illustrative of *pneuma* as designating "the principle of life residing in the breath;" or, as we would say, life itself, which is the result of breathing. Our blessed Lord gave up his life for men, and on the cross he said "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit," meaning the spirit of life he had, or simply life itself; having said so, we are told, he breathed out, or life ceased.

The following passages from the Old Testament are quite parallel to those just explained, and no one finds any difficulty in understanding them. "And when Jacob had made an end of commanding his sons, he gathered up his feet into his bed, and yielded up the ghost, and was gathered unto his people," Gen. 49 : 33. "Oh that I had given up the ghost, and no eye had seen me: I should have been as though I had not been," Job 10 : 18, 19, "Man dieth and wasteth away: yea man giveth up the ghost (*expieth*) and where is he?" Job 14 : 10. "She hath given up the ghost; her sun is gone down while it was yet day," Jer. 15 : 9.

SEC. V. PNEUMA, as already shown, is translated *spirit*. The English word *spirit*, we may observe, comes from the latin word *spiro*, to breathe; its radical force may be seen in the following compound English terms, inspiration, or in-breathing; expiration, or out-breathing. We will classify, so far as possible, the different modes in which this term is employed; and as far as these usages bear upon the object we have before us in this treatise, which is simply to determine what is meant by the spirit of man.

"*Spirit*" imports,

1st. The spirit, or breath of life; perhaps the idea will be more accurately presented thus—it imports the complex idea of breathing and so living; breath, and its result, life.

Of this usage a specimen was introduced at the close of last section, which may be here only referred to; it is Luke 23 : 46. In addition to it we may now note,

Luke 8 : 55, "and her spirit, (pneuma) came again, and she arose straightway:" she breathed anew and life was rekindled. This is another text exemplifying what Robinson calls "the principle of life residing in the breath."

Acts. 7 : 59, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit" (pneuma).

This, according to Robinson, is another example of *pneuma* importing "the principle of life residing in the breath." Indeed the martyr just called upon his Lord to receive back the life-giving breath, or to receive his life which he cheerfully rendered up as a sacrifice on the altar of Christianity. Alas! but this "spirit" has actually been turned into the man Stephen himself; and yet surely the narrative is plain. He cried "Lord Jesus receive my spirit."—and did he go away to glory? as a spirit did he wing his flight to the Redeemer's presence? No; "He kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, Lord lay not this sin to their charge.

And when he had said this, HE FELL ASLEEP."—The man, who was "*but flesh*," having the spirit of life in him, fell asleep. The spirit was not the man: Stephen and the *pneuma* he had were very different. He was stoned, it vanished; he returned to the dust, it returned to the charge of the universal Proprietor.

Dr. John Brown in his recent work, "The Dead in Christ," p. 21, says "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," surely cannot mean—let me lose the capacity for many centuries of knowing, loving, and serving thee." On which we would respectfully observe, that if this "spirit" was not necessary to his knowing, loving, and serving Christ, he might part with it and remain as thoughtful and affectionate and loyal as ever; but if it was the spirit of life he had from God, and than this it was neither more nor less, its departure would inevitably number him with the dead, who "know not anything," whose thoughts have perished, till a resurrection takes place by Power Divine. He fell asleep, and could he be awake also? he was buried, was he also unburied? In the calm sleep of unconsciousness he rests in hope of a revival to immortality.

James 2 : 26, "For as the body without the spirit (pneuma, margin "breath") is dead." Rev. 11 : 11, "After three days and a half the spirit (pneuma) of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet. Compare Gen. 6 : 17, and 7 : 15, 22, 23.

2nd. "*Spirit*," is employed to express heavy physical ailment.

Luke 13 : 11, "A woman which had a spirit (pneuma) of infirmity, and was bowed together," &c.

3rd. "*Spirit*" is employed to express some mental quality or state, good or bad.

Matt. 5 : 3, "Blessed are the poor in spirit" (pneumati)—i. e. the lowly in mind. In the parallel verse "spirit" is omitted, "blessed be ye poor." Luke 6 : 20. Matt. 26 : 41, "the spirit (pneuma) indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak."

"The mind, the disposition is ready, and disposed to bear these trials; but the flesh, the natural feelings through, the fear of danger, is weak and will be likely to lead you astray when the trial comes."—Barnes.

Luke 1 : 17, "The spirit (pneumati) and power of Elias;" i. e. the courage and zeal of Elias. 1 : 80, "The child grew and waxed strong in spirit" (pneumati). "That is, in courage, understanding, and purposes of good, fitting him for his future work."—Barnes. 9 : 55, "Ye know not what manner of spirit (pneumatos) ye are of;" "Spirit" here designates temper, or disposition. They misunderstood themselves. 10 : 21, "In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit" (pneumati) or greatly rejoiced.

John 4 : 23, "the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit (pneumati) and in truth;" i. e. "with a sincere mind, with a true heart, not with mere external rites." Robinson's *Lex. pneuma*, 2 b. Acts. 6 : 10, "The spirit (pneumati) by which he spake;" "Spirit," here means "energy, power, or ardor."—Barnes. 18 : 25, "Being fervent in spirit," i. e. exceeding zealous. 20 :

22, "Behold I go bound in the spirit (pneumati) unto Jerusalem;" i. e. with a firm resolution.

Rom. 1: 9, "Whom I serve with my spirit" (pneumati); i. e. with the greatest zeal. 7: 6, "we should serve in newness of spirit" (pneumatōs); i. e. "in a new and spiritual manner."—Stuart on Romans. Compare John 4: 23, above. 8: 15, "Ye have not received the spirit (pneuma) of bondage," i. e. the greatest degree of bondage—"again to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption," i. e. the greatest degree of filial affection—"whereby we cry abba, Father." See Macknight on the Epistles, Royal Octavo edition, London, 1835, p. 38, 2d col. 11: 8, "God hath given them the spirit (pneuma) of slumber;" i. e. the greatest degree of stupidity. See Macknight as referred to under the preceding text. 12: 11, "fervent in spirit" (pneumati); i. e. exceedingly zealous. Compare Acts 18: 25.

1 Cor. 2: 12, "the spirit, (pneuma) of the world," i. e. the wisdom and knowledge which this world can give;—the learning and philosophy which were so much valued in Greece.—*Barnes*. 4: 21, "Spirit (pneuma) of meekness," i. e. with a great wish and purpose to comfort and commend. 14: 14, "For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit (pneuma) prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful"—"my own feelings thus find utterance in prayer, but what I mean is not understood by others." Rob. Lex. *pneuma* 2 b. 15, "I will pray with the spirit (pneuma), and I will pray with the understanding also; I will sing with the spirit (pneuma), and I will sing with the understanding also."

The sense appears to be something like this;—I will pour out my desires in prayer, so as to be understood by others as well as by myself; or I will pour out my feelings; my joy, my love, my homage in praise, so as to be understood by others as well as by myself.

1 Cor. 14: 16, "When thou shalt bless with the spirit (pneuma)" &c.; i. e. bless God with thy mind, but in a language not understood by your fellow-worshippers. 2 Cor. 4: 13, "We having the same spirit (pneuma) of faith" &c. "The general sense here is—"We encounter these perils and afflictions *through the very same principle of faith* (namely, in the resurrection) which David had." *Bloomfield's Greek Test.* Perhaps "the spirit of faith" may require a sense somewhat stronger than that which Bloomfield assigns it, we should rather express it thus,—we having the same well-founded, and vigorous faith.

2 Cor. 7: 1, "Filthiness of the flesh and spirit" (pneumatōs). "By filthiness of the spirit (is meant) the pollutions of the *passions*, as shown in the inward workings of sin in the *imagination* and affections."—*Bloomfield*.

Gal. 5: 16, "Walk in the spirit (pneumati), and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh."

"By *pneumati*, most of the older commentators understand the *Holy Spirit*. But, as there is no article, that cannot be admitted. Besides, it is plain, from the words following, and from the opposition between flesh and spirit, at verses 17 and 18, that the sense is what some ancient and many

eminent modern expositors suppose, (as Beza, Rambach, Mor., Flatt, and Schott) *the spiritual part of man*, or the *spiritual principle* in man, THEIR REASON AND CONSCIENCE, enlightened by the Gospel, and sustained by the Holy Spirit."—*Bloomfield*. in lo.

Gal. 6: 1, "In the spirit (pneumati) of meekness"—i. e. "with love, and gentleness, and humility, and patience, and with a readiness to forgive when wrong has been done."—*Barnes*. Phil. 1: 27, "Stand fast in one spirit (pneumati), with one mind," i. e. "striving together strenuously for the furtherance of the Gospel."—*Bloomfield*. Eph. 4: 23, "be renewed in the spirit (pneumati) of your mind," i. e. in your understanding, in your affections and dispositions. 1 Tim. 4: 12, "Be thou an example of the believers—in spirit" (pneumati); i. e. "In the government of your *passions*, and in a mild, meek, forgiving disposition."—*Barnes*. 2 Tim. 1: 7, "For God hath not given us the spirit (pneuma) of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." The sense appears to be, God hath not made us timid, but bold and courageous; affectionate and prudent.

1 Pet. 3: 4, "a meek and quiet spirit" (pneumatōs), that is, meekness and quietness.

4th. "*Spirit*" is employed to express the idea of self, or personality.

Mark 2: 8, "Jesus perceived in his spirit" (pneumati); i. e. in himself; or simply, *Jesus perceived*. 8: 12, "He sighed deeply in his spirit" (pneumati), i. e., in himself; or he sighed deeply. Luke 1: 47, "My spirit (pneuma) hath rejoiced," or *I have rejoiced*—"in God my Saviour." This is parallel to the 46 v. "and Mary said, *my soul doth magnify*,"—or *I do magnify*,—"the Lord." Acts 17: 16, "While Paul waited for them at Athens, his spirit (pneuma) was stirred in him," i. e., *he* was greatly moved with distress and pity. Rom. 8: 16, "The spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit" (pneumati); with our mind, or simply *with us*.

1 Cor. 2: 11, "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit (pneuma) of man which is in him;" or what man knoweth the things of a man save the man himself. Compare Pro. 14: 10, "The heart knoweth his own bitterness;" the same idea might have been expressed in the language before us, from 1 Cor.—the spirit of man which is in him knoweth his own bitterness. Sometimes the formula is "the heart," sometimes "the spirit," but these and all similar modes of expression are invariably to be resolved into the fundamental idea of THE MAN HIMSELF.

1 Cor. 5: 5, "To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh," i. e., for his amendment or sanctification; "that the spirit," (pneuma)—the life—the man's life,—or *the man himself*—"may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." The same idea may be expressed by another scriptural form;—that his soul—his life—the man himself, may be saved from the second death.

1 Cor. 16: 18, "They have refreshed my spirit (pneuma) and yours;" i. e., refreshed *me* and *you*. 2 Cor. 2: 13, "I had no rest in my spirit (pneu-

mati), or simply, I had no rest. 7:13, "Because his spirit," (pneuma) or *he* "was refreshed." Gal. 6:18, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit" (pneumatos), or simply, *with you*. 2 Tim. 4:22, "The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit" (pneumatos), or *with thee*.

[To be Continued.]

Reasonableness of Christianity.

BY JOHN LOCKE, ESQ.—NO. I.

Redemption Implies the Fall—and by the Fall we Lost Immortality.

It is obvious to any one who reads the New Testament, that the doctrine of *redemption* (and consequently of the gospel) is founded upon the supposition of *Adam's fall*.

To understand, therefore, what we are restored to by Jesus Christ, we must consider what the scripture shows we lost by Adam. This I thought worthy of a diligent and unbiassed search, since I found the *two extremes* that men run into on this point, either on the one hand shook the foundation of all religion, or on the other made Christianity almost nothing. For whilst *some* men would have all Adam's posterity doomed to eternal infinite punishment for the transgression of Adam, whom millions had never heard of, and no one had authorized to act for him, or be his representative; this seemed to *others* so little consistent with the justice or goodness of the great and infinite God, that they thought there was no redemption necessary, and consequently that there *was* none, rather than admit of it upon a supposition so derogatory to the honor and attributes of that infinite being: and so made Jesus Christ nothing but the restorer and preacher of *pure natural religion*, thereby doing violence to the whole tenor of the New Testament.

And, indeed, both sides will be suspected to have trespassed this way against the written word of God, by any one who does but take it to be a collection of writings designed by God for the instruction of the *illiterate bulk of mankind in the way of salvation*; and therefore generally and in necessary points, to be understood in the plain direct meaning of the words and phrases, such as they may be supposed to have had in the mouths of the speakers, (who used them according to the language of that time and country wherein they lived,) without such learned, artificial, and forced senses of them, as are sought out and put upon them in most of the systems of divinity, according to the notions that each one has been bred up in.

To one that thus unbiassed reads the scriptures, what Adam fell from, it is visible, was the state of *perfect obedience*, which is called *justice* in the New Testament, (though the word which in the original signifies justice, be translated righteousness.) And by this fall he lost paradise, wherein was tranquility and the tree of life, (that is, he lost bliss and immortality.)

The penalty annexed to the breach of the law, with the sentence pronounced by God upon it, shews this.—The penalty stands thus: "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." How was this executed? He did eat; but in the day he did eat, he did *not actually die*, but was

turned out of paradise from the tree of life, and shut out forever from it, "lest he should take thereof and live forever." This shews that the state of paradise was a *state of immortality, of life without end*; which he lost that very day that he ate. His life began from thence to shorten and waste, and to have an end; and from thence to his actual death, was but like the time of a prisoner between the sentence and the execution which was in view and certain. Death then entered and shewed his face, which before was shut out and not known. So St. Paul: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;" (that is, a state of death and mortality.) And "In Adam *all die*;" that is, by reason of his transgression, all men are mortal and come to die. Rom. v. 12, and 1 Cor. xv. 22.

This is so clear in these cited places, and so much the current of the New Testament, that nobody can deny but that the doctrine of the gospel is that death came on all men by Adam's sin—only they differ about the signification of the word *death*.

Some will have it to be a *state of guilt*, wherein not only he, but all his posterity was so involved, that every one descended of him *deserved endless torment in hell-fire*. I shall say nothing more here how far (in the apprehensions of men) this consists with the justice and goodness of God, having mentioned it above. But it seems a strange way of understanding a law, (which requires the plainest and most direct words,) that by *death* should be meant *eternal life in misery*. Could any be supposed by a law that says, "For felony thou shalt die," not that he should lose his life; but be kept *alive*, in perpetual, exquisite torments? And would any one think himself fairly dealt with that was so used?

In addition to this, they would have it to be also a state of *necessary sinning*; and of provoking God in every action that men do—a yet harder sense of the word *death* than the other. God says, "that in the day that thou eatest of the forbidden fruit, thou shalt die"—that is, (according to this doctrine,) thou and thy posterity shall be ever after incapable of doing anything but what shall be *sinful* and provoking to me; and shall justly deserve my wrath and indignation! Could a worthy man be supposed to put such terms upon the obedience of his subjects, much less can the righteous God be supposed (as a *punishment of one sin* wherewith he is displeased) to put a man under a necessity of sinning continually, and so multiplying the provocation? The reason of this strange interpretation we shall perhaps find in some mistaken places of the New Testament.

I must confess by death here, I can understand nothing but a *ceasing to be*, (that is, the losing of all actions of life and sense.) Such a death came on Adam and all his posterity by his first disobedience in paradise; under which death they would have lain forever, had it not been for the redemption by Jesus Christ.

If by the death threatened to Adam, were meant *the corruption of human nature in his posterity*, it is strange that the New Testament should not any where take notice of it, and tell us that *corruption*

seized on all, because of Adam's transgression, as well as it tells us so of death. But (as I remember) every one's sin is charged upon himself only.

Another part of the sentence was, "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life;" "*in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground: For out of it wast thou taken. Dust thou art; and unto dust thou shalt return.*" This shews that Paradise was a place of *bliss* as well as immortality; without toil and without sorrow. But when man was turned out, he was exposed to the toil, anxieties and frailties of this mortal life, which should end in the *dust*, out of which he was made, and to which he should return; and then, have no more life or sense than the dust had, out of which he was made.

As Adam was *turned out* of Paradise, so all his posterity was *born out* of it; out of the reach of the tree of life. All, like their father Adam, in a state of mortality; void of the tranquillity and bliss of Paradise. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin."

WE CANNOT BY RIGHT COMPLAIN OF THIS LOSS.

But here will occur the common objection, that so many stumble at: *How doth it consist with the justice and goodness of God, that the posterity of Adam should suffer for his sin—the innocent be punished for the guilty?*

Very well, if keeping one from what he has no right to, be called a punishment. The state of immortality in Paradise is *not due* to the posterity of Adam more than to any other creature. Nay, if God affords them a temporary, mortal life, it is his gift; they owe it to his bounty, they could not claim it as their right; nor does he injure them when he takes it from them. Had he taken from mankind anything that was their right, or did he put men in a state of misery worse than *not being*, without any fault or demerit of their own, this indeed would be hard to reconcile with the notion we have of justice, and much more with the goodness and other attributes of the Supreme Being, (which he has declared of himself, and which reason as well as revelation must acknowledge to be in him,) unless we will confound good and evil, God and Satan. That such a state of extreme irremediable torment is worse than *not being* at all, if every one's sense did not determine against the vain philosophy and foolish metaphysics of some men, yet our Saviour's peremptory decision has put it past doubt that one *may be* in such a state that it had been "good for him not to have been born." But that such a temporary life as we now have, with all its frailties and ordinary miseries, is better than *not being*, is evident by the high value we put upon such a life ourselves.

And therefore, though all die in Adam, yet none are truly *punished* but for their own deeds. "God will render to every one (how?) according to his deeds." "To those that obey unrighteousness, indignation, and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doth evil." "We must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he has done, whether it be

good or bad." And Christ himself, (who knew for what he should condemn men at the last day) assures us in the two places where he describes his proceeding at the great judgment that the sentence of condemnation passes only on the workers of iniquity; that is, such as neglected to fulfil the law in acts of charity. Matt. vii. 23 and 25: 41 and 42; Luke xiii. 27. And again, our Saviour tells the Jews "that all shall come forth out of their graves; they that have done good, to the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." But here is no condemnation of any one, for what his forefather Adam had done, which it is not likely should have been omitted, if that should have been a cause why any one was adjudged to the fire, with the devil and his angels. And he tells his disciples, that when he comes again with his angels in the glory of his Father, "that then he will render to every one according to his works." Matt. xxvi. 27.

Debate on Human Immortality.

AT THE BRISTOL ATHENÆUM, ENGLAND.

We had the pleasure of attending recently an interesting debate by the members of the Discussion Society, a flourishing and highly important body connected with the Bristol Athenæum, on the following proposition:—"Nature affords no evidence of Human Immortality." It is not our intention to furnish anything of the nature of a report of the debate, but merely to offer a few observations on one or two points, upon which the opponents of the above proposition laid considerable emphasis in support of their side of the question. It was affirmed by several, and too much conceded by all, that there was a *common sentiment of all mankind* in favor of the constitutional immortality of man. We pause not now to remark on the *kind* of immortality and soul-nature asserted by the ancient speculators on the subject, viz.,—their *pre-existence* and *transmigration* theories, which, we presume, the modern advocates of natural immortality will not be willing to accept, as they ought consistently, when they appeal to the opinions of the ancient philosophers, in evidence of their theory. This we pass by for the sake of challenging the assumption, that *all mankind have ever accepted the doctrine of natural human immortality*. Certain philosophers of Egypt, Assyria, Persia, Greece, and Rome,—who, by the way, ought not to be regarded as so many *independent* testimonies,—taught this opinion without doubt, but that it was the common opinion of all, even in these countries, is no by means true. The doctrines of Pythagoras, Plato, Socrates, and Zoroaster were the opinions of the philosophic few, not the expositions of the faith of the common people. Let Socrates himself, the intellectual champion of the soul, be our witness. "Can this soul of ours," he asks, "being such and of such a nature, when separated from the body be immediately dispersed and destroyed, as most men assert?" Phædo 68. According to Socrates "most men" asserted the *destruction* of the soul in death. They who are familiar with the reasoning of the Phædo, and subscribing to the basis of

the argument, are prepared to affirm with Cato,

It must be so—Plato, thou reasonest well ;

should be content with the strength of the Socratic superstructure, and never think in the face of their champion's testimony to the contrary, of superadding the common-place argument of the common consent of mankind. The Athenian philosopher knew that no such common consent existed, and hence the necessity of his elaborated argument to produce that consent. But why in the enumeration of the opinions of mankind should the *Hebrews* and *Arabians* be omitted? Both these peoples had their philosophic sects, as the Pharisees among the former, who subscribed to the oriental conceit of the soul's separate state and immortality ; but the faith of the people generally was not identical with that of their speculative school-men. Omitting any reference to the sacred Scriptures, which the rules of the Ath. Soc. forbid to be cited in evidence, and where undoubtedly the popular doctrine is emphatically denied, we may yet turn to other Jewish literature, where the opinions of the Jews are recorded, for the sake of testing the assertion of a universal assent of mankind ; and if we refer to the Apocryphal writings, the evidence is decisive against this common-place assumption. "Who shall praise the Most High in the grave," asks the author of *Ecclesiasticus*, ch. xvii. 27—32, "instead of them which live and give thanks? Thanksgiving perisheth from the dead, as from one that is not : the living and sound in heart shall praise the Lord. For all things cannot be in men, because the son of man is not immortal." Again, "O Elias, how wast thou honored in thy wondrous deeds! . . . who didst raise up a dead man from death, and his soul from the place of the dead, by the word of the Most High,"—ch. xlviii. 4, 5. When Phariseeism flourished among the Hebrews, which was not even known till after the Babylonish captivity, then this ancient Hebrew faith in the non-immortality of man was pushed in some cases, as is natural, to an extreme—even to the denial of any kind of spiritual existence, and any future life at all ; as in the case of the antagonistic sect of the Sadducees, from whose rash ultraism many sought their hope of a future life in the Babylonish fancies of the newly imported philosophy of Phariseeism. We have alluded also to Arabia as furnishing another exception to the assertion of a common consent among mankind. Dr. Good says, "If we turn from Persia, Egypt and Hindostan to Arabia, to the fragrant groves and learned shades of Dedan and Teman, from which it is certain that Persia, and highly probable, that Hindostan, derived its first polite literature, we shall find the entire subject (viz., the immortality of the soul) left in as blank and barren a silence, as the deserts by which they are surrounded ; or if touched upon, only touched upon to betray doubt, and sometimes disbelief." Ecclesiastical historians have marked the fact that the philosophers of Arabia denied the natural immortality of man, and tell us that Origen was sent thither to teach them the Pythagorean philosophy of immortal-soulism. Here are then considerable exceptions to the alleged common

consent of mankind, and, consequently, the argument, such as it is, falls to the ground.

We were much surprised that the eloquent opponent of the introducer of this question at the Athenæum debate should have sought an argument in support of the immortal soul theory in the emphasized assertion, that *as matter is indestructible, therefore, what is not matter, viz., the soul, is, a fortiori, indestructible*. Did we hold the theory of the immortality of the soul on the ground of its being, as alleged, an *immaterial* principle, the very argument we should admit, of the non-destructibility of matter, would supply us with an argument for the *destructibility* of the mind or soul. For the word *immaterial* is the negation of what is material,—the *opposite* and *contrast* of materiality,—and, therefore, has none of the properties or attributes of that which is material. If, therefore matter is indestructible, that which is *not* matter or *immaterial*, for the reason assigned above, must be capable of *destruction*. This reasoning, if not altogether satisfactory, has as good claim to the Cationian commendation as any arguments in the *Phædo*. But when it was asserted that matter is indestructible, is it meant *absolutely* indestructible? Granted that *man* cannot destroy a single particle of the material globe, but does it follow that the *Maker* of matter cannot destroy that which He created? If it be allowed that God created the matter of the universe, it must also be allowed that He can destroy it. So that the assertion is only *relatively* true that matter is indestructible.

What, however, has the destructibility or otherwise of matter to do with the question—"Nature affords no evidence of human immortality?" The affirmants of this proposition make no assertion about the nature and properties of matter : they assert that the being called *Man* is the mysterious product of organization,—that he depends upon his organization for conscious life, and the capability of developing the varied phenomena of his being ; and that when he is *disorganized*, he, the being, man, ceases to be. The elements of his being may not be destroyed, but in their dispersion, have sought other affinities, and entered into other organic relations, but *he*, the being, *man*, who depended on their chemical union in the human organism, perishes in their dispersion. He shares the fate of all physical organisms,—as the brute, and the plant when disorganized and reduced to their elements cease to be respectively an *animal* and *plant* nature, so he also, in the same catastrophe, ceases to be a *man*,—like them he ceases entirely to be. The consolation to mortal man in the contemplation of death is, that, in his case, a merciful promise is given by the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that a life of fidelity to truth and righteousness shall be rewarded by a *re-organization* in his personal resurrection from the dead. So that, although he dies like brute beasts which perish, *unlike* them, he has the sublime possibility of living again in "the resurrection unto life."—*Ham's Ch. Examiner*.

BR. C. F. HUDSON's article came too late for this number, but will appear in the next.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 15, 1854.

"**MATERIALISM UNSCRIPTURAL: OR, the Doctrines of George Storrs Refuted.** By Rev. N. D. George."

'Such is the title of a Tract recently issued by the Methodist Episcopal Tract Society, New-York. It is substantially the same matter we noticed last winter, which appeared in nine articles, *Zion's Herald*, Boston, Mass.

What our name was attached to it for, unless to catch attention, we do not know, for our friend, George has given us but a small portion of his attention, in his tract of 48 pages. He has made another person, many of whose sentiments we never approved, the prominent object of his attack. It was well that in re-publishing the articles from the *Herald*, either himself or the Publishers of the Tract struck from the title the words, "*Examined and.*" For it is apparent that it is not an "*examination* of the Doctrines of Geo. Storrs," as the author does not presume to look at the foundation stone of the theory we advocate. He gives us a passing *fling* and rushes on to meet one whom he can more easily refute; but, lest he should not have sufficient cause to triumph before men, he places our name at the head, or sets us up "on high," as Ahab did Naboth, that he might seem to have the greater victory; but we can forewarn him in this matter that his end will be as inglorious as that of Ahab.

Why did he not keep to his text, "and examine and refute the doctrines of George Storrs"? Why did he leave his text to wander somewhere else? We think we understand the reason. Our foundation was too *material* for the weapons he had to attack with. He could not strike us at the root without pouring contempt on the Mosaic account of man's creation, thus showing that himself and associate laborers are the real "infidels." "The Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground," saith the inspired record; and all the wood, hay, and stubble of theological patch work, ever put forth by the advocates of *immaterialism*, falls to the ground before the Divine testimony of man's origin, as Dagon fell before the Ark of God.

A few things are introduced into the Tract, relative to our views, not embraced in the original articles; these we may notice after a while; but in the meantime, if our readers will turn to our article in the Examiner for Dec, 1853, and the continuation of the subject in a few numbers the first of this

year, they will find a sufficient "*refutation*" of N. D. George's effort, so far as "the Doctrines of Geo. Storrs" are concerned. If N. D. George would like to try his skill truly, on our views, our columns are open for him. Let the question be stated fairly—"Did the Lord God form man of matter?" Will Mr. George or any of the Methodist Tract publishers take the *negative* of this question? We *affirm* that God did so form man; and that hence the very heading of the Tract before us is *bare-faced "Infidelity."* Come then to rescue of your own characters, ye who are casting stones at us. The Examiner is open for any of you who stand approved of those on your side of the question.

A DILEMMA.—Dr. Adam Clarke, the learned English commentator, was a believer in the immortal-soul theory; hence sometimes found himself in a hard place, where *guessing* had to answer for facts. In his note on Acts 9: 40, where Peter was instrumental in raising the deceased Dorcas to life, and it is said, Peter "turning to the *body*," says Dr. C., "*soma* ; the lifeless body, for the spirit had already departed." Well, what did Peter say to this "lifeless body," whose "spirit had departed" to heaven, as the Doctor held? He "Said, *Tabitha arise.*" Now it is very strange that Peter should think of calling on "the lifeless body to arise without first calling on the "*departed spirit*" to return! But strange to tell, not one word is said about that "spirit" in the whole transaction! But Peter calls "the body" *Tabitha*, and said, "*arise.*" Now the body was Tabitha or it was not. If it was, then the "departed spirit" was not, and had no conscious existence except in fable or theological speculation. If the body was not Tabitha, then Peter made a great blunder in calling it so; but that he did not mistake in the matter is evident from the fact that when he thus spoke, "*She* opened her eyes; and when *she* saw Peter *she* sat up." Strange that such small things should be so particularly noticed and not one word be said about getting her soul back from heaven, and its coming into the cage again.

We come now to the dilemma of Dr. Clarke: He says:—

"As Dorcas was a woman so eminently holy, her happy soul had DOUBTLESS gone to the Paradise of God. Must she not therefore be filled with regret to find herself thus called back to earth again? And must not the remembrance of the glories she had now lost, fill her with dislike to all the goods of earth? No: for 1. as a saint of God, her Makers *will* must be *her's*; because she knew that

will must be ever *best*. 2. It is VERY LIKELY that in the case of the revivescence of saint or sinner, God MERCIFULLY *draws a veil* over all they have seen or known, so that they have no recollection of what they have either seen or heard. Even St. Paul found it IMPOSSIBLE to tell what he had heard in the third heavens, though he was PROBABLY not in the state of the dead. Of the economy of the invisible world, God will REVEAL NOTHING."

Here is a great man completely swamped by his immortal-soul theory. The words "doubtless—very likely—impossible—mercifully—probably not," and "reveal nothing," in the remarks of the Doctor, we have marked in small-caps to call attention to the vain conjectures and bold assumptions to which the advocates of the common theory are driven.

What is to be done with poor Dorcas' immortal soul that had gone to Paradise, i. e. to heaven? How is it to be reconciled to coming back again? Even her "*Maker's will*" could not quite satisfy Dr. Clark in the case; how much less then the "*happy soul*" of Dorcas herself? The Dr. is in a dilemma! What shall he do? Why, he invents the "*very likely*" notion that "*God mercifully draws a veil over all*" she had "*seen or known*!" He was afraid, "*doubtless*," that without this, Dorcas might rebel against His "*will*!" And to give plausibility to this assumption in support of a baseless theory, the Doctor perverts fact in Paul's case. He says, "Paul found it *impossible* to tell what he had heard in the third heaven," &c. On what ground was it impossible? Was it because God had drawn "*a veil over*" it? No such thing. For such a lively view had the apostle retained of those "*abundant revelations*" that he had to take "*a thorn in the flesh*," lest he "*should be exalted above measure*." If he had only found Dr. Clarke's "*veil*" he could well have been spared the "*thorn*."

But, says the Doctor, Paul "*was probably not* in the state of the dead." Thank the Doctor for that admission; for, if he was not in that state whatever he saw or heard is no evidence that dead men can see or hear; and that they do not see nor hear, when actually dead, is abundantly testified in Scripture; and we have no occasion to resort to such vain conjectures and subterfuges as the Dr. is here driven into to hide the nakedness of his *ghostly* theory of "*Dorcas' happy soul*" going to "*paradise*" at death.

Finally, the Doctor, to solve the whole mystery of these "*Know-nothing*" resurrected ones, adds—"Of the economy of the invisible world God will *reveal nothing*." Hear that, all ye who unfold so

vividly the flight of souls to Heaven, and describe their state and condition there! Remember Dr. Clarke's words, and stop your speculations: "*God will reveal nothing*;" and if you pretend to know about it, either you or Dr. C. are mistaken. "But then the Doctor was in a *dilemma* or he would not have said so!" No doubt he was, and all other advocates of the theory of the distinct and separate conscious existence of an entity called the soul are in the same dilemma.

Intermediate State of the Dead.

Our friend Clark, of the *Christian Advocate*, passes very lightly over the Rich man and Lazarus, though he says "The parable is perfectly in point." He remarks:—

"The objection that this is a parable will not avail to break the force of the great moral truth it teaches. It is either history or a parable: if history, then it is a record of events that have actually taken place; if a parable then it is a representation of events that may occur."

The oft-repeated assertion that a parable is, in all cases, a representation by something that has been or may be, is a mere assumption, and is contrary to truth. Let any one read the parable of Jotham, Judges 9th, or the parable of the two "great eagles," Ezekiel 17th, which is given by God himself, and he will be satisfied that parables are not always taken from things that have been or may be.

That a parable is "a representation of events that may occur," we readily admit; but what should we think of taking a house to represent a house; a lamb to represent a lamb; a prison to represent a prison? In other words, what should we think of taking the identical state or thing to represent that state or thing? It would, in fact, be no representation at all. As Dr. Clark admits this scripture to be a parable it cannot be a representation of a particular person, or persons, in the literal state of death; hence, we are compelled to look for some other event or events that are represented than that of literally dead men; and especially as we are not to assume, without undeniable evidence, that our Lord contradicted the testimony of the prophets, who declare that in the day of man's death "*his thoughts perish*," *Psa.* 146: 4, that "*the dead praise not the Lord*," *Psa.* 115: 17, that, there is "*no remembrance of God in death*," *Psa.* 6: 5, that death is "*a land of darkness as darkness itself*," *Job* 10: 22, that "*the dead know not any thing*," *Ecl.* 9: 5, and that "*there is no knowledge in sheol*," *Ecl.* 9: 10.

This last text has the exact corresponding word to express the condition, or state, of the dead with that used in the parable by our Lord, and translated *hell*. *Sheol* is the Hebrew word in Eccl. 9 : 10, and *Hades* is the Greek word in the parable; though our translators have rendered that in Eccl. *grave*, and in the parable *hell*; words which are of precisely the same import, as any one can see by comparing Psa. 16 : 10, with Acts 2 : 31, in which places these corresponding words are both rendered *hell*; and in the latter place is a quotation of Peter, on the day of Pentecost, showing that Christ had a *resurrection* from the state of death—from *sheol* or *hades*—wherein inspiration declares there is no knowledge. Now we ask our friend Clark, in all candor, if he really believes that our Lord did intend, by a parable, to contradict the plain and explicit testimony of the Old Testament scriptures? He had commanded us to *search* those scriptures as revealing to us eternal life: those scriptures reveal to us the state of death as being one without thought—without knowledge—as a state in which there is no “reward,” Eccl. 9 : 5, where we cannot praise God, &c., and all this in plain, positive language. In the face of all this testimony, shall we—*dare we*—affirm that our Lord Jesus Christ covertly—in a parable—taught directly an opposite doctrine? And that too, when he never once directly affirmed that literally dead men are in a conscious state; but taught his followers he would raise them up from the dead “at the last day?” He must be credulous indeed, or strangely entangled by the “traditions of men,” who can thus interpret the teaching of him who is “the way, the truth, and the life.”

The parable is the “representation of events” which were about to take place, *viz* : a change in the dispensations from the Mosaic to the Christian, as the context shows, verse 16 : which would remove the peculiarities of the Jewish economy, introducing a more spiritual one, adapted to all nations, or embracing those who were not under the law given by Moses, called *goyim* in Hebrew, and *ethnos* in Greek, or *gentiles*. This change in God’s administration with men was in fact a falling back on the covenant He made with “*Abraham*” before the law was given, and which embraced “all the families of the earth;” tho’ up to the advent of Christ, the Jews only had shared, evidently, in that peculiar favor, and hence it was especially their “life time.” By their rejection of Christ—as their dispensation then passed away—they are *represented* in a state of death, which was a political and ecclesiastical death; in which, of course,

that people were not literally dead, and hence could be, in truth, represented in a most wretched condition—or in torments. Such has been their condition for near 1800 years, and their claim of relationship to Abraham has brought them no relief.

On the other hand the change in the dispensations, which revived the Abrahamic covenant and brought it out fully to the view of the *ethnos*—the Gentiles—placed the believing among them in that relation to Abraham which is aptly “represented” by being in “Abraham’s bosom,” whither they had been brought through the ministration of angels, or *messengers*,—for so the word signifies—who have proclaimed the love of God to “the world,” and not exclusively to one nation.

In a parable we are to look only for the main scope and design of it; and not like some mere theorists and speculators attempt to find something to correspond with every minutiae that is introduced into it. This parable we regard in the light, then, of a simple and forcible “representation” of the different states of those under the law covenant, and those who were turned to the covenant of grace, or favor, made through Abraham in Jesus Christ, and fully opened at the advent of Jesus some 1800 years ago, and which is still in force, so that they who are Christ’s are “Abraham’s seed and heirs according to the promise,” and “are blessed with faithful Abraham;” having promise of life eternal when Christ shall return “*from heaven*” to raise all his saints from the dead “at the last day.”

Dr. Clark next speaks as follows in support of the theory he advocates—

“When St. John, upon the Isle of Patmos, had heard the wonderful revelations made to him, filled with wonder and astonishment, he fell down to worship the messenger of God; but that messenger said, ‘See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book.’ Rev. xxii, 9. Do we not here obtain a glimpse of not only the conscious being, but the avocations also of those who have died in the faith?”

This text affords not the slightest countenance to the theory that dead men are conscious. Enoch and Elijah were “translated that they should not see death,” which was no great advantage if friend Clark’s theory is the truth. Either of these men might have been the person who addressed John. Both of them were “prophets.” Unless then it can be proved that John was addressed by one who had actually died, here is nothing to help the common theory: there is not even a “glimpse” to help our friend in his effort. Br. Clark proceeds—

"St. John says: 'I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true? . . . And white robes were given unto every one of them, and it was said unto them that they should rest yet for a little season.' Rev. vi. 9-11. These souls not only possessed a conscious existence after they had been 'slain' for the cause of Christ, but they were also conscious of the wrong they had suffered, and were looking forward to the period of their vindication with anxious desire. Nor was this all; 'they cried with a loud voice,' and were afterward robed in white, and told to rest yet a little season. Here, then, they have a conscious existence, power to express their desires, and capability of being comforted by gracious assurances. Though persecution had done its work, and the bodies of the martyrs had been consumed by the faggot, or devoured by wild beasts, or wasted in deep and dark dungeons or dens and caverns of the earth, yet, after it had destroyed the body, there was a conscious life remaining over which it had no power."

We give our friend the benefit of his entire remarks in this case; and we must say, that we should think any sober and reflecting mind must see how vain it is to appeal to this text in support of the common theory. In the first place, these souls had no existence at the time of John's vision of them, nor for several centuries after, probably; as it is most likely it is a representation of the feelings of persons suffering by the Papal persecutions; it being the fifth seal. The Doctor saith, "These souls had been *slain*?" Were immortal, undying souls "*slain*?" Did men "*kill*" them? So it would seem, according to the Dr. But unfortunately for his theory these souls had *blood*, which is *material*: "how long dost thou not avenge *our blood*," say they. They were not *theological* souls then, whatever else they might be. And then they seem not very happy, for they are "looking forward to the period of their vindication with *anxious desire*," saith the Dr.; and they are "conscious of the wrong they had suffered," he affirms. Now all this does not look much like being in Heaven, does it friend Clark? But it does look as though it might be a true "representation" of the feelings of suffering saints, while yet on earth, under a long and bloody persecution, which seemed to have no end; and the white robes seem to "represent" the "righteousness" which they would obtain in enduring the long night of persecution they were passing through, after which they were to "*rest a little season*"—not in heaven, but "under the altar"—that is, "in the dust of the earth," till the trial of others should be also ended. To talk of giving *immaterial* souls white robes, in heaven, to cover them; and of their "being comforted," there,

with the "assurances" of their "*blood*" being "*avenged*" *after* they are introduced into the glorious society of heaven, surely needs some plainer testimony than we have ever yet seen to make it even look like truth.

We pass what the Doctor saith on, "whether in the body or out of the body," with a brief remark, because we have so lately spoken of this text in another place. The Doctor says, If "the apostle" had not "believed that the soul may have a conscious existence out of the body—how could he have been in doubt whether *his soul* was really in the body or not?"

Paul saith not one word about "*his soul*," nor any other person's *soul* in the transaction. Paul was not in the habit of talking about "the soul" like modern theologians. He talks of *man*—"I knew a *man*," &c; that *man* had a "*vision*;" how, or in what manner it was made he could not tell, for he did not know, but God did, and there he leaves it. Here is no proof of the conscious existence of a man when dead, or of a distinct entity in man called the soul.

We come now to Dr. Clark's last text. He says—

"One more passage upon this point must suffice, though it would be difficult to exhaust the many Scripture proofs that bear upon it. St. Paul says that Christ Jesus '*died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him.*' 1 Thess. v. 10. How emphatic! Whether we wake or sleep, live or die, whether we are in this world or the other, we shall live together with him, shall enjoy his life and the consolation of his Spirit here, and, in the eternal world, shall be glorified together with him! These words show that everywhere, and in all circumstances, genuine believers, who walk with God, *have life*—and not only life, but also communion with Him who is the source of all life. Indeed, they clearly express that, so far as the great ends of spiritual life and communion are concerned, the living have no advantage over the dead."

This is the first time we recollect to have seen this text introduced in support of the common theory; and we rather think if it was so "difficult to exhaust the Scripture proofs," on the subject, it would never have been introduced. It is "emphatic," that is certain; but not in favor of Dr. Clark's theory. It is emphatic in favor of the apostle's theory which he had just expressed in the previous verses, *viz.*,—That that there is hope for the dead saints, because Jesus died and rose again; therefore God will bring up from the dead all that sleep in Jesus, and those who are alive at the time of that event will "not go before them that are asleep; for the Lord himself shall descend from

heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God ; and **THE DEAD IN CHRIST** shall **RISE FIRST** ; THEN we which are *alive* and remain shall be caught up *together with them* [the raised ones,] in the clouds to **MEET** the Lord in the air ; and so shall we be ever with the Lord."

Here, then, is *how* the saints are to "live together with" Christ: not through death, nor in death, but by a **RESURRECTION** from the dead, if "asleep in the dust of the earth," at his return "from heaven ;" or, if alive, by a change to immortality, in a "moment, in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump." Compare 1 Thess. 4 : 13—18 ; and 5 : 1—11, with 1 Cor. 15 : 61—54. We regard the appeal to 1 Thess. 5 : 10, by our friend C., as most unfortunate for his theory ; and instead of affording any support to it, taken with the context, is its most ample refutation.

More Assumptions.

Zion's Herald, for July 26th, has a communication from D. Todd, on the inquiry, "Has man a soul?" It is placed on the last page of that folio sheet, which is a retired position. We cannot wonder at it, as the author is too far *behind* the times to appear in a very conspicuous position.—As a theological curiosity we give his first argument to our readers. It might be well to place it in some theological museum. To the question,—*"Has man a soul?"* the writer says :

"We argue the affirmative first, from the fact that he was created in the image of God—in holiness, righteousness, and knowledge. God is a spirit. No matter, no form, or combination of matter can receive the impress of Jehovah's attributes, his moral likeness ; but man was created in the image of God ; therefore, man has a soul, a spirit on which that likeness was impressed."

If assumptions could be admitted as proof, this assumer has doubtless carried all before him. The principal assumption is, that man was created in the image of God's "holiness," and of course must have a soul to "receive the impress of Jehovah's attributes, his moral likeness." That man was made in God's "moral likeness" is a pure assumption without one solitary text of Scripture to sustain it. By the superiority of man's organism, over other animals, laying the foundation for superior intellectual development, he was made capable of understanding law addressed to his mind, and so was fitted to make a **MORAL** development under the appliance of a law—not without it. Every thing the Lord God made was pronounced "**VERY GOOD** ;" but not one thing was

pronounced **HOLY** ; because holiness is a development, not a **CREATION**. Holiness, so far as created beings are concerned, is the result of action under some rule or law. "Where there is no law there is no transgression ;" and, by consequence, where there is no law, there is no such thing as holiness. Holiness, in created beings, never exists till there is **ACTION** in relation to some given rule of conduct. Adam, therefore, at his creation, was not possessed of the moral image of God : whatever the image was, it was not what this writer, in *Zion's Herald*, affirms. Nor is there any evidence that man, by sin, absolutely lost the image of God in which he was created ; but the contrary is clearly the doctrine of the Bible. God assigned as a reason why the murderer should die, after the flood, that "in the image of God made he man ;" Gen. 9 : 6. Paul saith, "MAN ought not to cover his head, [when he prayeth] forasmuch as he is the **IMAGE** and glory of God ; 1 Cor. 11 : 7. James saith, "Men are made after the **SIMILITUDE** of God ;" Jas. 3 : 9. This testimony establishes the fact that man still possesses the image of God,—the likeness, the resemblance, the similitude, whatever it was ; hence it was not holiness ; and all such assumptions are purely gratuitous and unwarranted except by the "**TRADITIONS OF MEN**," through which "God's counsel" is made "void."

REV. EDWARD WHITE.—The following communication from Br. White, we trust, will be carefully read and duly weighed, comparing it with the Scriptures of truth. We think it is a subject that deserves unprejudiced attention ; and after the able articles of Br. Ham, just finished in the **BIBLE EXAMINER**, we judge it right and desirable that another, in England, should have the privilege to respond in our columns, and we trust that Br. Ham will take no exceptions to this course, tho' he might have preferred that the response should first appear in the *Christian Examiner*, but Br. White has chosen otherwise, and we cannot sit as judge in that matter. We love and honor them both. May the Lord bless them and us—guiding each of us into all truth—the **LOVE** of it, and bring us to His kingdom through His Son.

The Propitiatory Death of Christ.

To the Editor of the Bible Examiner.

MY DEAR SIR :—I avail myself thankfully of your invitation "to make it appear that it is impossible to do greater violence to the Scriptures than to attempt to expel from them the doctrine of the propitiatory death of Christ, AS UNDERSTOOD BY THE BAPTIST AND CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES OF GREAT BRITAIN."

The proviso above printed in small capitals, is a very essential qualification of my promise, for I should be sorry to undertake a defence of that which Mr. Ham has all along represented as the doctrine of "popular Christianity," on the subject of the Atonement. He everywhere represents this popular doctrine to be that the crucifixion of Christ was "designed by God himself for his own personal satisfaction as the moral governor of the world;" and he opposes to this notion his own view "that we are saved by the free grace or unpurchased mercy of our gracious Father, through Jesus Christ, the Mediator or medial personage through whom God dispenses these blessings of great salvation." Now, in the fewest words I beg to state, without wasting your space in prolonged expression of wonder at Mr. Ham's mistake, that he has egregiously misrepresented "popular Christianity" amongst us, and I should think among you. He has wasted his ammunition upon a pasteboard fortress. The veritable Silistria has yet to be assailed. Universally in England among our churches, the work of Mr. Gilbert (husband of the celebrated Ann Taylor, author of Hymns for Infant Minds,) on the Atonement, is regarded as setting forth the prevailing views on this subject. He was appointed Congregational Lecturer in order to express them. From that work any reader may easily satisfy himself that whatever a few fanatics may rave in obscure corners about "personal satisfaction," a very different doctrine prevails through the length and breadth of the country. There will be found abundant evidence of the fact, and of our belief of it, that the very notion of the Christian Atonement excludes the conception that it was designed by God himself as a personal satisfaction. Mr. Gilbert, following in the track of all the best writers, points out the eternal distinction between the Fatherly and the Royal characters of God, his private relationship to the sinner, and his public relationship to the universe. He shows that the idea of demanding personal satisfaction for sin is incompatible with the idea of the party offended against, himself providing the ransom for sinners. God himself has "set forth this propitiation," and therefore it is absurd to attribute to him personally vindictive feelings against the sinner. It is the Royal character of God as the Holy and Benevolent Governor of the creation which demanded a signal display of the perpetuity of the Law which unites sin and suffering, in the act of pardoning the transgressor himself: while His paternal character prompted him to provide the means of "reconciling the world unto Himself." Paul does not say "of reconciling Himself to the world." That was never needed. God's personal feelings were always compassionate. We believe as firmly as any objector, that "we are saved by the free grace of our gracious Father," but we also hold that since God is holy as well as kind, King of the Universe as well as Father of the sinner, He has been pleased to manifest this mercy under a dispensation of providence which awfully evinced that He has not laid aside His judicial righteousness. Mr. Ham, I think, evidently mistakes the proof of one proposition for the disproof of another. It may be

true that God's personal wrath was not appeased or satisfied by the death of Christ; and yet it may be true that His judicial character as Public Governor was vindicated, and the moral interests of the creation conserved by that "declaration of his righteousness." Rom. 3: 26. "Whom God hath set forth, a propitiation, to declare his righteousness with respect to the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." If it should be replied that in the sentence referred to Mr. Ham has used the phrase, "God's personal satisfaction AS MORAL GOVERNOR," the rejoinder is that such a combination of terms is utterly indefensible. Personal satisfaction, is a phrase which implies personal angry feeling to be appeased; and such a phrase is not applicable to the calm and holy moral administration of God. A righteous King may heartily love his rebellious child, yet, find himself unable in consistency with his own Public Honor, and the moral welfare of his dominion to pardon him by a mere act of arbitrary forgiveness, unattended by any display of his judicial righteousness and respect for his own Authority. If Mr. Ham intends to deny the real validity of the distinction between the Fatherly and the Royal characters of God, he must establish his position by arguments which have not yet appeared: and which I suspect will have some difficulty in appearing. Mr. H. believes in a final tremendous display of the righteousness of God in the punishment of sinners, notwithstanding the "free grace" of the Heavenly Father, and it is for him to show why it is more contradictory to the divine goodness to believe in the manifestation of that grace through the sacrifice of Christ, in vindication of the Divine holiness, than it is to believe in an ultimate exhibition of that holiness in the penal sufferings of the condemned. If in the one case there be no "personal satisfaction," as Mr. Ham would admit, why should there be in the other?

With respect to the allegation that if Christ has satisfied the divine justice by his merits, we are saved by merits and not by grace, it is sufficient to reply that this objection too is founded upon a gross commercial view of the death of Christ which is generally repudiated by intelligent believers, and therefore cannot be introduced into the controversy by any one really desirous of doing justice to his opponents, and to the argument.

These are preliminaries; but it was necessary to fill up some of the pitfalls constructed by Mr. H., before we can with advantage erect that battery of Scripture which will, I think, crumble his theological fortress to atoms, even when the fire is directed by the feeblest of hands.

The argument, then, that Christ did thus "suffer for sins, the just for the unjust," 1 Pet. 3: 18, consists of three principal parts. The FIRST is derived from considerations on the nature of the Hebrew sacrifices, and the application of the terms which denote them to the death of Christ in the New Testament writings;—the SECOND, from declarations in the ancient prophetic Scriptures;—and the THIRD from the language of the New Testament itself.

Mr. Ham disposes of the argument derived from considerations in the nature of the Hebrew sacri-

fices for sin, by such observations as these. He says, "An elaborate ritualistic worship, like that of the ancient Hebrews, affords abundant scope for ingenuity to expatiate in. Highly imaginative minds, fond of curious speculations, have by the arts of a Christian Cabalism discovered in the Scripture sacrifices all their own favorite dogmas; and having imposed upon these symbolic institutions their own cabalistic interpretations, they employ them, after the illogical fashion of reasoning in a circle, as arguments for the truth of those dogmas." He then affirms that it is our duty "to seek in the Scriptures itself for the key to their interpretation," and proceeds to "indicate this general principle"—that they signified and expounded personal duty and expressed personal professions of reverence for the will of God, denying that they were intended to teach "expiation by substitutionary suffering."

It is somewhat amusing to find such writers as Dr. Pye Smith, and George Hanley Taber, our two most learned recent authors on Expiatory Sacrifice, set down among "highly imaginative minds, fond of curious speculations:"—each of them being men singularly free from poetry and enthusiasm, and if ever men were free from cabalistic mysticism, free from it. Our worthy friend must please to qualify his censure a little, and admit that at least some men of cool heads, and vast learning, and great piety, are profoundly convinced believers that the Hebrew sacrifices signified something more than he in his learning and coolness is willing to allow to them. For my part, I must beg you, Br. Storrs, to print, and not to omit—the expression of my deep and respectful persuasion, that something much more weighty than this fling at the Cabalists will be necessary to overturn the great works in English Theology which establish the piacular character of many of the Jewish sacrifices.

Mr. Ham, as I have shown, now and then mistakes the honest proof of one thing, for the disproof of another; and that when there is no consideration whatever to prevent both being true. Nobody doubts that many of the Hebrew sacrifices were eucharistic, or symbols setting forth the pious professions of the worshippers, and nobody that I ever heard of considers those particular sacrifices as "symbols of expiation by substitutionary suffering." But the question is, whether other some of the Hebrew sacrifices were not of this latter character; symbolic expiations; "SIN OFFERINGS."

There are some things that are so plain that the difficulty is to find media of proof whereby to convince those who deny them; and amongst such plain things most readers of the Bible reckon the fact that the Books of Moses describe sacrifices which were obviously designed to set forth the idea of expiation of sin by substitutionary sacrifice. Let any man seeking for truth without any theory or prejudice, (without Mr. Ham's theory among others,) examine all those passages in the books of Exodus and Leviticus which prescribe the ceremonial for the "trespass" and "sin-offerings" of Israel; let him observe the repeated command to "lay the hand upon the head of the sacrifice;" let

him mark the explanation of that act distinctly given in Leviticus xvi, 21, where it is declared to signify "putting all the transgression of Israel upon the head of the goat,"—that goat which in the 10th verse is expressly said to be for an atonement to be presented before the Lord; literally, TO MAKE AN EXPIATION UPON HIM, LECOPHER ALO, and in the Septuagint ΤΑΥ ΕΧΙΛΑΣΑΘΑΙ ΕΡ ΑΥΤΟΥ;—and then say whether it does not rather require a very "curious art of speculation" to expel this idea of substitutionary sacrifice from the scriptures. Set such a person to examine carefully the works of Outram, Pye Smith, and Faber, to which I have referred, and even let him consult the Hebrew Lexicon of the rationalist Gesenius in the department of sacrificial language, and I am much mistaken indeed if the result be not to lead him to denounce this attempt to persuade the people that a few gibes at imaginative spirits are sufficient to subvert the well-established conclusion in which after abundant examination had, all divines and all ages have agreed, with the exception of a few speculators who have distinguished themselves by the rejection of EVERY doctrine essentially Christian. The Jews at all events have uniformly received this notion from their own scriptures, as it was likely they should, considering the expressions employed. "The body of the sinner," says Aben-Ezra—quoted by Pye Smith—"deserved to be burned for his sin, only the mercy of the Divine Nature accepted his offering as a substitute and propitiation, whose blood should be instead of his blood, and its life instead of his life."

Now the argument is that the terms which were employed by the Greek translators of the Old Testament scriptures to denote the expiatory sacrifices of the Mosaic writings, are employed by the New Testament writers to describe the death of Christ. In Leviticus iv, the HATTATH or sin-offering, is rendered by the Greek version AMARTIA; and this sacrificial term is applied to the death of Christ. "God sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh and PERE AMARTIAS for sin, for a sin-offering, condemned sin in the flesh. Rom. viii. 3. And again, "For he hath made him to be SIN for us, (AMARTIA, a sin-offering) who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 Cor. v. 21. If this be not the signification of the term in these two passages, can a more natural sense be found by one who denies that there is any such notion as imputation of merits or demerits in the Bible. The phrase "to be made sin on our behalf," take it how you will, must offer a serious difficulty to such a commentator.

Again the Apostle John affirms that Christ was an ILASMOS or propitiation for our sins, and for the sins of the whole world. 1 John ii. 2, and iv. 10. Now we find this term employed by the Septuagint as the translation of the Hebrew term HATTATH or sin-offering; as in Ezekiel xlv. 27. "And in the day that the priest, defiled by the dead, goeth into the sanctuary, unto the inner court, to minister in the sanctuary, he shall offer his sin-offering, ILASMON, saith the Lord God." Twice then the HATTATH was an expiatory sacrifice, a substitutionary sin-offering. If he did not

intend this, what in the name of all Hebrew and Greek did he intend? Mr. Ham will not deny that the death of Christ is spoken of by the apostle as an "offering and a sacrifice" presented to God "on our behalf," Eph. v. 2 : and putting this together with the fact that other language is used which could suggest no other idea than that of an expiatory sacrifice for sins, is it too much to affirm that the popular dogma of redemption by the blood of Christ, is very much like the doctrine of the New Testament.

The SECOND argument is one which I believe Mr. Ham does not notice. In the PROPHETIC SCRIPTURES, the death of the Messiah is spoken of as plainly as possible under the character of a TRESPASS-OFFERING for the sins of mankind. I refer especially to the 53d chapter of Isaiah : "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities ; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way : and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all. . . . Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him, he hath put him to grief : when thou shalt make his soul, or life, an offering for sins, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands." Nearly every line in this passage is an affirmation of the substitutionary death of Christ, but the word translated in the 10th verse AN OFFERING OF SIN, is one which alone suffices to settle the question in dispute. It is ASHAM, the term always employed in the Mosaic law to denote a TRESPASS-OFFERING. The explanation of it given by Gesenius is a "sacrifice for transgression, by which particular faults or sins were expiated." Surely this should be satisfactory.

I will enter on the third argument in another letter, having already trespassed sufficiently upon your space. I hope the infinite importance of the subject will appear as an excuse. With all good wishes, believe me, dear brother Storrs,

Yours, very truly, EDWARD WHITE.
Camden Town, London, July 16, 1854.

POST MASTERS.—There are some of this useful class of men who are a discredit to the name. We have at several different times had letters from them with notices to discontinue the EXAMINER. To prevent fraud, we have adopted the practice of returning these Post Office notices to the subscriber, in a sealed letter, paying the postage ourselves. In nearly every instance we have found the Post Office statement false. One Post Master was a Methodist, and did not *feel* to let his neighbors read the EXAMINER ; but his deeds came to light by our returning his letter to the subscriber. A few days since we received one of these Post Office notices to *discontinue* the EXAMINER, and immediately returned it to the subscriber, stating

that we had sent the paper regularly. We received the following letter from that subscriber in reply. We omit the names, in hopes that we shall not need to expose such Post Masters, *personally*, though they ought to be called upon to pay for their delinquencies.

—, July 28th, 1854.

Mr. Storrs:—The Post Master's notice to you to discontinue sending the BIBLE EXAMINER to me was received yesterday, with your note thereon, which is the first knowledge I have had of its being sent. After subscribing for it, I called at the Office three or four weeks in succession, and was told that there was none there. On the receipt of the notice to discontinue, which you returned to me, I went to the office and called for the numbers that had been sent and was told that they had been "*tore up*" and otherwise disposed of. "Reason, not taken." However I do not wish to have it discontinued as there is now some prospect of obtaining the numbers that may hereafter be sent.

Respectfully yours.

"THE DISCUSSION."—Prof. Mattison has furnished us with another article, but it came too late for the present number. We were in hopes to insert a part of it, but found we could not without laying over the article from our English Correspondent—Br. White—which was received *before* the Prof.'s. However, our readers may expect it, with our reply in the next EXAMINER ; which will be issued as early as possible.

PALESTINE.—We commend the following recent account of famine in that country to the attention of those who too fondly represent it as returned to its primitive fruitfulness. We ought to guard against fanatical representations on this and all other subjects. A calm waiting on God and following His providence, when it clearly indicates His will, is the only true ground of action, as it is also the only safe one. We have seen fanaticism enough about Palestine as well as some other topics. The account referred to of famine in the land of Judea speaks thus—

"FAMINE IN THE HOLY LAND.—Recent letters from the venerable city of Hebron, calling upon Sir Moses Montifore for relief, say that the land of Judea is 'consuming its people,' that 'the dearth which prevails is unparalleled in the annals of the country. Failing harvests are superseded by drought, so that the face of the earth is literally scorched, and the wail of the famished multitudes is heard by day and by night, and our streets are thronged with starving children, who vainly implore for food.'"

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Our circumstances render it necessary that we should make a statement of the fact that it is impossible for us to issue the EXAMINER more than once each month for the four next months; and even this will be done with considerable embarrassment to ourself.

Our proposition, made in November last, was—"If we receive one thousand dollars by Dec. 25th, from subscribers or otherwise, we will publish TWICE each month, at \$1 per year." Up to January FIRST we had received but little over HALF that sum; and the WHOLE AMOUNT received, from subscribers, up to the PRESENT TIME is only about \$900. The composition, press-work, and paper for 24 numbers of the EXAMINER varies very little from \$800; add to this \$100 for office rent, and \$900 is the result. In this estimate, it will be seen, we have made no account of our labor, and our time has been almost exclusively devoted to the EXAMINER. We have done very little at publishing other works; and what we have done in that line, this year, has no more than barely met the expense, by the sales, if that; and the sale of other works has been less this year than last, while our expenses have much increased.

Our friends responded most nobly at the time of our loss by fire, for which we still hold them in grateful remembrance. About \$100 of that money went to replace paper for the EXAMINER, destroyed by fire. We have house-rent to pay for our family residence, which is not a small item in and about New-York; then we must have bread to eat and raiment to put on.

Now, we ask our patrons, considering the amount of our receipts, and our necessary expenses, shall we wrong any of you if we give you for the next four months, ONE EXAMINER per month, instead of two? That will give you a volume this year of 20 numbers, as rich, to say the least, as any previous numbers ever published. We regret the necessity of thus curtailing, but see no way to avoid it. We hope to resume the semi-monthly issue in January, 1855, but this will depend on the patrons of the EXAMINER. We cannot issue it but once each month, unless we have at least as many paying subscribers at the COMMENCEMENT of the year, as we now have. We have to pay more for paper than we did six months ago. Fuel and eatables, of nearly all descriptions, have gone up in price, till a poor man has to watch and pray much to obey the injunction, "Take no thought for the morrow." We feel no disposition to complain. It is not for ourself that we issue the EXAMINER. If two-thirds of our present subscribers renew

their subscription, and get half as many more NEW ones by January 1st, we shall go on again SEMI-MONTHLY, if the Lord gives us life and health.

—◆◆◆—
 "A PROPHETICAL STREAM OF TIME: OR, AN OUTLINE OF GOD'S DEALINGS WITH MAN FROM THE CREATION TO THE END OF ALL THINGS: By Sir Edward Denny, Bart."

This is a beautiful CHART five feet long and over two wide, opening with a luminous representation of an indefinite period before creation, inscribed "GOD IS LOVE;" and including the Hebrew word "ELOHIM." Below this, in the same luminous representation is a small ball, representing, it seems, "GOD'S PURPOSE" of Creation, then follows a picture of the globe, from which commences the "STREAM OF TIME," a representation by a perpendicular column, about one inch and a half wide, extending the whole length of the chart, from the Creation to the Millennial age, which is represented by another luminous scene, followed by the "little season," of the loosing of Satan, and then winds up with the new heaven and new earth.

On the Stream of Time is represented the principal events recorded in Scripture in the past, and the subjects of prophecy in the future. By a SIDE stream, issuing out of the main stream, is represented the call of Abraham. This side stream flows parallel with the main one, down to the crucifixion of Christ, where it terminates. The fortune of the posterity of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, is represented at various periods, down to the crucifixion, by marks running through this side stream, and into and out of the main one. The time of the establishment of the KINGLY government of Israel, is marked in the side stream by a CROWN: the passing away of that kingly power is marked by the transfer of the crown to the main stream, and Babylon appears at that point. "The present interval," from the cross to the Millennial age, is marked by a luminous eye, representing the Church of God on earth, looking down to another luminous representation in the Millennial age of the Church glorified. The work is accompanied with a "Companion to the Chart," and a miniature chart, serving as a Key to a full understanding of the whole. Though we may not agree with its author in some particulars, yet the Chart and Companion are exceedingly interesting to such as have a taste for study by such helps.

✍ Eld. J. B. Cook, Rochester, N. Y., has imported some of them from England, in fine order. They are for sale by him, and also by R. T. Young, 140 Fulton-street, New-York. PRICE, of Chart and Companion, \$7.